DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 049 196 SP 004 867

AUTHOR Dobbs, Stephen Mark
TITLE The Paradox of Art Education in the Public Schools: A Brief History of Influences.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 48p.; Paper presented at AERA annual meeting, New York, 1971

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Art Appreciation, *Art Education, *Commercial Art, *Educational History, *Educational Theories

ABSTRACT

Art education has been a part of the curriculum of American public schools for more than a century, since the first programs for drawing instruction were organized in Massachusetts in the 1870's. Since that time, a theme has emerged which continues to characterize art education into the present: the paradox that art education has consistently embraced rationales for its place in the curriculum which have generally advanced the interests of everything but art. To understand how art education has become historically tethered to the service of almost every other area of school life, this study examines the leading ideas of art educators within the broad educational, cultural, social, and economic contexts within which public school art has functioned. The influences are organized in the study in eight sections: 1) Concern for Commerce: In the Service of Industry; 2) Faith and Morality: The Influence of Philosophical Idioms; 3) Child-Centered Culture: Trends in Psychology and Mental Health; 4) Science and Sensibility: The Growth of Research; 5) The Child As Artist: Impact of the Progressive Era; 6) Government and Art: In the Service of Public Culture; 7) Apollo and the Sacred Grove: Relationships with Artists and Museums; and 8) The Percolation of Taste: Fad, Fashion, and Contemporary Art. (Author)

ED049196

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE PARADOX OF ART EDUCATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: A BRIEF HISTORY OF INFLUENCES

Stephen Mark Dobbs
Stanford University

The man who put art education on its feet in America first stepped onto Yankee sod on a Spring day in 1873. Walter Smith's arrival from England was eagerly awaited by Massachusetts educators who were anxious to make use of Smith's organizing talents for the cause of industrial drawing in the public schools. Since Smith's day, and the ideas around which he developed the first extensive drawing instruction program, art education has evolved through numerous permutations of its leading rationales. As the field emerged from its nineteenth century beginnings a theme became clear which has continued to characterize art education into the present day: the paradox that art education has consistently embraced rationales for its place in the curriculum which have generally advanced the interests of everything but art.

To understand how art education has become historically tethered to the service of almost every other area of school life, one must examine the leading ideas of art education within the broad educational, cultural, social and economic contexts within which public school art has functioned. A variety of forces within the school and without have influenced the development of ideology: the needs of industry, philosophical currents, the increasing import of educational psychology, taste and contemporary art, artists and museums, government and public culture, the growth of research, and the progressive era. These contexts have provided opportunities to legitimize art in the curriculum, but in so doing have created a pattern of essentially non-artistic ends for the public school art program.

SP004867

CONCERN FOR COMMERCE: IN THE SERVICE OF INDUSTRY

A hundred years ago, when Walter Smith stepped into the spotlight, and the currents of change in school and society began to work their developmental effects on art education, the nation had recently emerged from the Great Struggle. The wounds of the war between the states were to be long in healing, especially the tremendous economic disparities that had been created. For example, the war aggravated an already disproportionate antebellum distribution of American industry. Before the Civil War the North had moved far ahead of the South in the diversity and size of her industrial establishments, but the utter devastation of Southern factories in the mid-1860's, coupled with the war-spurred growth of industry in the Northern states, greatly increased the gap. As the 1870's approached, the defeated South was locked in the throes of Reconstruction while a triumphant North steamed full ahead, with burgeoning industries and a prosperous economy.

The consequence of these developments for public education in the United States were several: first, the stronger economy of the North enabled more money to be available there for the cause of Common Schools, championed just two decades earlier by Horace Mann, and therefore innovation in educational planning -- such as the expansion of the curriculum -- was more likely to occur there. Second, the dominance of industrial, as opposed to agricultural, growth in the North created a need for specialized skills in the new factories and mills which ringed the New England states. Third, the egalitarian spirit which emerged in the North from the War signified an extension of training to an ever broader population, so that all might share in the new vocational opportunities given rise by Northern industrial growth.

One very specific and urgent demand of the new industrial powers in the North was for draftsmen to design machinery, cut patterns, and standardize parts in the factories and textile mills. Thus industrial drawing became a valued skill and educators planned for it in the school curriculum. Programs began to develop in Massachusetts, the harbinger of educational progress in New England due to the leadership of Mann, and its centrality in commerce and government. Benjamin Franklin had advocated drawing in the curriculum as far back as 1796, to train the coordination of the eye and hand, but no curricula were devised to implement his proposals.[1] Horace Mann, after visiting Prussian schools in the 1840's, watched children learn penmanship and mechanical drawing by Peter Schmid's system and, duly impressed, imported the techniques for use in Massachusetts. Mann credited drawing exercises with facilitating the development of manual skill and as sound preparation for mechanical and industrial work.[2] So by the 1870's there was considerable interest in drawing as a subject in the public schools.

Massachusetts became the first state to enact regulations making industrial drawing a compulsory part of school study, in 1870, and just a few years later both the Boston Board of Education and the State Board invited Walter Smith from his successful drawing program in South Kensington to fully organize drawing instruction and curriculum.[3] When Smith arrived he found the most ardent supporters of the program were businessmen, who hoped to see the schools provide their factories with a steady stream of trained (at public expense) draftsmen and designers, who would glorify with their skill and taste products Made-In-America.[4]

Smith had devised a series of geometric exercises which were intended to coordinate the movements of hand and eye, and which emphasized precise and clean draftsmanship and craftsmanship. The student advanced by steps through the

exercises, which were based upon forms abstracted from nature. As the principal of Massachusetts Normal Art School (founded 1873), Smith trained teachers and masters of industrial drawing, and his graduates in subsequent years initiated art programs throughout the United States, with Smith's Teachers' Manual of Freehand Drawing and Designing as their guide.[5]

A related development was the growth of the manual arts movement, which stressed acquiring tool-using competencies for the transformation of raw materials into finished products. Manual training included shop and machine work (such as woodworking), and overlapped the industrial art interest in mechanical drawing. For a time, the manual training movement threatened to absorb art education, which would have eliminated many of the cultural and aesthetic considerations which were to become significant in the teaching of art.[6] Manual arts and industrial arts (i.e. - drawing instruction) were merged in many school systems, and joint professional conventions were held after the turn of the century.[7] But the manual arts movement, which had originated in England through William Morris' reunification of art and industry in handcraftsmanship, remained theoretically separate from art education, and in fact assumed the full responsibility for industrial drawing in the public school only after the purposes and practices of art education had expanded beyond those narrow bounds in the twentieth century.[8]

Thus the first organized efforts to build art education programs in the public schools were directed toward the service of industry, and throughout the last three decades of the nineteenth century the concern for commerce was a major rationale for instruction in drawing.[9] Art education had not begun with a broad vision of what art experience, and not only industrial drawing, could provide for children's growth, but nevertheless its utilitarian value to industry had insured it a place in the curriculum of the public school.[10]

FAITH AND MORALITY: THE INFLUENCE OF PHILOSOPHICAL IDIOMS

Drawing programs in the schools, which by the last decade of the nineteenth-century had been carried by graduates of Massachusetts Normal Art throughout the country, were being established primarily for the production of penmanship and design competencies, useful in a variety of business and industrial vocations.[11] But the complexity of art education's development derives from the fact that no single rationale has ever been able to completely dominate its ideology. While art educators (i.e. - instructors of drawing) seemed to be totally committed to mechanical and industrial drawing, other educators and philosophers writing about education and art were exploring the facility of art for spiritual and moral purposes.

Although Horace Mann had taken note of the "beauty and expression" of drawing he had seen in the Prussian schools, American educators in the early days of the Common School by and large ignored the goals of self-expression, appreciation of beauty, and development of imagination. Such objectives were not conceived to be part of the "practical" curriculum, with its emphasis on the 3 R's. Anyway, school time for most public school children was precious; their parents typically could not afford the academies or colleges which followed the free elementary school, so those few years of formal education were to be occupied with work and learning. The school was not the place for frivolous dabbling in art, an occupation for ladies and gentlemen of leisure.[12]

But by Walter Smith's day, the expanded public school system -- now including free high schools and capped by the land-grant state universities -- represented a growing diversity of educational thought and practice. The nation

had become more education-conscious than ever, and a greater share of resources were being channeled to the task. The school took firmer shape as a major social institution. Curriculum expanded to include new interests. Of particular consequence for art education was the emergence of a number of philosophical trends which shifted justification for the art program from the motives of the industrial revolution to new rationales.

The first of these trends grew out of the theories of Friedrich Froebel, whose kindergarten had been studied by American educators in the 1840's. Elizabeth Peabody, Horace Mann's sister-in-law, imported Froebel's scheme at Boston in 1867.[13] During subsequent years she organized a curriculum which placed a premium on art experiences, since Froebel believed that manipulation of materials and self-expression were vitally important to children's growth.[14] In the playful setting of the kindergarten, which eventually became standard formula in American public schools, the child could develop into an individualistic, fully-functioning human being, and be thus better prepared for the end purpose of education, the realization of "spiritual communion in the unity of the Absolute". Therefore the utility of art experiences was in helping to produce a harmony of mind and heart and hand which would attune the child to greater harmonies. Now art was to work in furtherance of faith and morality.[15]

A second philosophical resource for new rationales in art education was transcendentalism, which had first appeared in the pre-Civil War literature of Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry David Thoreau, Margaret Fuller, and others. These were high-minded and idealistic thinkers, who stressed beauty, self-reliance, and individualism. One of their members, Amos Bronson Alcott, ran his own private school (1834-39), in which drawing was included to train hand-eye coordination and

to stimulate youngsters' imaginative powers. Elizabeth Peabody, who taught at Alcott's Temple School before her European exposure to Froebel, has written of Alcott's placing of busts of famous men in the classroom to inspire the students towards high ideals.[16]

The championing of high ideals and individual expression made the artist a logical hero, whose explorations represented the seeking of a higher order of values than those of everyday life, values which "transcended" ordinary reality. This combination of Platonic and Romantic emphasis on Beauty and God, which is elicited in Emerson's essay on art ("Art should exhilarate and throw down the walls of circumstance"), provided a rationale for the inclusion of "aesthetic and spiritual development" in the curriculum, such as John Stuart Mill once described.[17] Although no direct link has been established between the transcendentalists and art educators around the turn of the twentieth century, it was about that time that art appreciation began to appear in the classroom. Through "picture study", which was a more-or-less formula study of the Old Masters, it was thought that students would, like Alcott's pupils a half-century before, be inspired to the good life and recognition of the beauty of the works of the Creator.[18]

"Picture study", which rested in part on the structure of nineteenth-century aesthetics, had a social support as well. America's industrial magnates, seeking the finest art work for their chateaus and townhouses, were paying hundreds of thousands of dollars for European masterpieces.[19] Titans such as Andrew Carnegie, Henry Frick, J.P. Morgan, and Andrew Mellon all brought priceless works to this country and later installed them in great museums for everyone to see and enjoy. Furthermore, the popular journals appointed Old Master painting and sculpture as one of the highest status symbols, thus engaging the appetites and interests

of their readers. So it was appropriate, with the increased public awareness of great art works, for art educators to emphasize their study.[20]

The suggestion of an associative effect between philosophical idiom and developments in art education is stronger in the case of the third ideological resource, Idealism. Like Froebelism and Transcendentalism, Idealism supported the development of the human being towards the end of faith and morality. Wilhelm Hegel, the European philosopher whose idealist aesthetics bore a semimystical kinship to Transcendentalism, held that art embodies in concrete, sensuous form a higher reality, which Hegel called the Absolute Idea or Will. "Good" or "bad" art was a revelation of the Divine, the artist's objectification of the Ideal Form. Through seeking these ideal forms, and giving substance to them in media, man could discover through art the harmonies of the universe.[21]

Hegelian thought was embraced by no less a figure than a U.S. Commissioner of Education, William Tormey Harris (1889-1906).[22] In the last third of the nineteenth century Harris and other American educators popularized the German Idealism of Hegel, Kant, Fichte, and Schelling, for its priority of spiritual values over material ones. Harris believed that art is a moral force of the highest importance, and that artists have the duty of portraying the "conflict of ideals". Therefore, the student must learn, through development of his idealization powers, to look at art objects as paradigm models of the "Good", as sensuous embodiments of spiritual and moral force.[23] Harris considered the art of antiquity and of the Renaissance as the finest expressions of such ideals. Harris' ideas supported the picture study movement, and the study of "beauty" in the classroom, but it may have created an interesting side-effect as well: the type-form blocks.

The type-forms were pieces of wood or plaster shaped as geometrical solids, a three-dimensional extension of some of Walter Smith's exercise plates (i.e. - spheres, cones, pyramids). These blocks were used as models for drawing. The theory was that familiarity with the "forms" would enable the student to "see" them in all the varied manifestations of worldly appearance. Thus the models would presumably stimulate the imagination and train the capacity for idealization. John S. Clark, of the Pratt Institute, where type-form blocks were pioneered, believed that the subjective idealizing power derived from study of the models constituted the essence of creative activity.[24]

The history of art education, like all histories, represents to a considerable degree the search -- perhaps "grasping" is more accurate -- for connections between people, places and events which tend to make some sense of things. This probing of relationships is tenuous at best, for "cause" and "influence" could legitimately range, in the present context for instance, from the implantation of a single thought in the mind of some obscure drawing instructor, to the transformation of entire teaching and curriculum systems. It seems appropriate to give recognition here to the caution implied, since these nineteenth century philosophical idioms must be considered no more than a tangential influence on art education in any direct sense. But indirectly they provided a resource for new ideology, a climate of supportive ideas, and helped inject into the swirling waters of the educational system the values of faith and morality, the uses of art to attain harmony with the Creator by perceiving the grandness and perfectability of his Design.

CHILD-CENTERED CULTURE: TRENDS IN PSYCHOLOGY AND MENTAL HEALTH

The appreciation of beauty became an important rationale for art education, but it was not to be attained only through the contemplation of great works of

art.[25] The first systematic approach to appreciation was developed by Arthur Wesley Dow of Columbia University, who influenced generations of art teachers through his students and followers, who themselves exercised leadership which had formerly been the monopoly of Massachusetts Normal Art. Dow believed that "the true purpose of art teaching is the education of the whole people for appreciation".[26] He proposed to develop it through a knowledge and understanding of the structure of art. This was a spinoff of the Hegelian philosophy, calling for mastery of the simple forms of art. Dow developed a theory of instruction based on formal numbered exercises organized around principles of line, value and color. He worked with John Dewey at Teachers College from 1904-1922, and welcomed the work of the French modernists at a time when most critics were hostile to the radical new forms which were emerging from Europe.[27]

But the structured curricula of Smith and Dow rested on assumptions about children (for example: anyone could learn to draw by mastering the formal exercizes) which were to be challenged by the developing field of educational psychology. The "new" science of Psychology (traditionally a phase in the study of Philosophy) swept like a wave over the American academic community in the second half of the nineteenth century. The European intellectual heritage of Helmholtz, Fechner, Wundt, Galton and Darwin furnished the groundwork for new studies of man and his behavior. In education this trend was exemplified by the growth of the Child Study movement, begun by G. Stanley Hall ("phylogeny recapitulates ontogeny"), who had earned Harvard's first doctorate in psychology in 1878. The movement was devoted to the systematic and scientific study of children. Respect for their individuality and dynamic qualities, encouraged by the educational ideas of Pestalozzi, Froebel, and Herbart, created growing interest in a "child-centered" curriculum which would focus on the actual needs and abilities of school children.

One source of information about the nature of children was their artwork, which at the turn of the century meant primarily drawings. At Stanford University, in 1902, Earl Barnes and other pedagogues studied student drawings and suggested they had discovered an important indicator of children's felt and psychic needs. Barnes recommended art experience in the child-centered classroom as a suitable outlet for emotional expression and growth. To facilitate this kind of development his Child Study group advised the use of larger pieces of paper (rather than small sketchbooks) and experimentation with different kinds of media, such as easel paint (still a "fad" seventy years ago).[28]

G. Stanley Hall, Edward Thorndike, Lewis Terman and others studied children with the new tools of educational research and psychological science, such as intelligence testing. It was noted that many of the psychometric techniques would have limited if any application to children's art work, because of the subjective and individualized character of their drawings, but this did not curb attempts to study child art empirically. But Hall made another and perhaps more important indirect contribution to art and art education in America: he brought over Sigmund Freud.

The much-heralded visit of Freud to Clark University in 1909 introduced ideas to American pedagogues which were portentous for art education. Freud's emphasis on the power of the unconscious, and the need for human beings to find outlet for their repressed feelings, provided a new and expansive rationale for art in the classroom. As Freud explained more fully in later writings,[29] art was one form of play or escape for these inner tensions and pressures.[30] Its highly subjective, intuitive, often non-verbal character made art an excellent vehicle for emotional expression. Thus art in the classroom could be used, like physical

recreation courses, for "letting off steam". Now art had become an instrument for mental health.

The mental health theme had two major aspects to it. The first involved the growing competition for time and resources among different subject-matter interests in the curriculum. As the schools became increasingly oriented toward verbal skills, art became a familiar item at the bottom of administrators' shopping lists. Of course, John Dewey had written, in How We Think (1910), about intelligence in such a way as to provide parallels between intellectual growth and the way an artist works.[31] But the convenient dichotomy of cognition-affect was employed to remove one contender from the curriculum, thereby art was pigeon-holed in a kind of "extra-curricular" area beyond the pale of the "academic". There art could provide rest, play and relaxation from the "work" of "subjects". Thus art was justified for its "leisure" value.[32]

The other rationale under the aegis of mental health was the use of art in the treatment of maladjusted children. Activities with such materials as crayons and paints were found to be useful, for example, with autistic children, for whom the verbal and structured materials of the classroom were inappropriate. Art experience led to play, psychomotor stimulation, and the externalization of the child's interests.[33] Art educators have worked closely with psychologists and psychotherapists since the 1920's to develop programs in art for the mentally disturbed, sometimes in connection with public school settings. Margaret Naumberg, for example, has been studying the therapeutic applications of art experience for children for over 30 years.[34]

SCIENCE AND SENSIBILITY: THE GROWTH OF RESEARCH

Child Study educators recommended the analysis of child art as an efficacious procedure for discovering the nature of children, since it was believed that children's drawings constituted basic data revealing emotional and mental growth. Thus the first research in art education was conducted primarily by psychologists and child development specialists, who used drawings as a tool for general investigation of children. Among early studies were those which tried to systematically classify drawings of children. These included work in Europe and in America, such as that of Ricci (1887), who advanced the "intellectualist theory" which holds that children draw what they know and not what they see; Barnes (1902), who concluded that drawing is a non-verbal language, a way of expressing ideas for the child;[35] Kerschensteiner (1905), whose study of over 100,000 children's drawings yielded a stage theory of drawing development, including such categories as "schematic" and "illusions of the 3rd dimension"; and Burt (1921), who pointed out that the Gestalt quality (cohesiveness) of children's art increases with maturity.

These studies, and others, could have provided empirical legitimacy to innovational art programs of that day; but psychology was still a relatively new discipline, and no channel of regular communication existed between psychologists and art educators. The pages of School Arts, the major journal of art education in the early twentieth century, are devoid of recognition of a growing body of information about children's artistic development.

The interest in emotional and psychic needs melded well with the increasingly popular ideas of Freud, whose effect was to reinforce the developing progres-

sive orientation towards permitting the expression of "repressed forces" in the child. Freud's emphasis on the unconscious and its expression through art and play activities (the two have been synonymous for most art educational history), gave new impetus to the study of children's drawings.[36]

As educational psychologists became more sophisticated with their tools and procedures, the consequences of scientific research became more promising. But a dichotomy was developing in art education; attitudes toward research tended to cluster around two poles, one viewing research with apprehension and fear that it would demean the interior, subjective character of art experience; the other attitude was one of healthy acceptance of research insofar as it could be useful, especially in helping to back up or deflate theories advanced by authorities in the field who tended to promulgate their ideas without meeting the test of confirmation. Elliot Eisner has described the character of the anti-research faction in art education:

> Art educators were true believers and the question of evidence or data or analysis was often considered an attempt to "verbalize" or "intellectualize" art. Research frequently became the object of derision and researchers to ridicule. Research was seen as a mumbo jumbo of digits that made little sense and had even less relevance to art. Frequently straw men were set up to lambast those who attempted to inquire methodically into problems of art education. Romance, it seems, was good enough. Art education was a passionate field concerned with the sensibilities and any attempt to analyze those sensibilities might dilute or destroy the very sensibilities it was trying to develop.[37]

A particularly important piece of research during the between-the-wars period was Florence Goodenough's study of the relationship between children's drawings and their intellectual maturity. In 1926 she published one of the first scientifically reliable scales for rating the drawings of children.[38]

Goodenough's "Draw-A-Man" scale has since become a standard instrument for assessing intelligence in children. Its non-verbal orientation makes the scale especially useful with autistic youngsters and children at a preliterate stage of development. Perhaps in anticipation of the feminist movement, Goodenough's former colleague Dale Harris published in 1963 a "Draw-A-Woman" instrument as well.[39]

The organization of research in art education is attested to by mention in the 1931 convention program of the Eastern Arts Association of a "Research Committee".[40] There was also a great deal of information constantly coming in from Europe, where research in creativity and perception had implications for the teaching of art. For example, the Gestaltists held that the proper subject matter for psychology is behavior considered in its totality, experience in terms of the wholistic and cohesive nature of each individual. This meant, for art, thinking of the child's entire creative and mental development as the proper objective of art education.

Gestalt psychologists were particularly interested in problems of perception. They devised experiments with simple moving displays or with lights switched on and off to generate apparent movement. Some art educators were acquainted with Gestalt dot pattern studies and electrical brain field investigations, most importantly Viktor Lowenfeld, whose own concept of perceptual categories ("visual" and "haptic") were tested and later built into the groundwork of his leading text in art education.[41]

Other classic studies of the Progressive Era included Rose Alschuler and La Berta Hattwick's massive Painting and Personality (1947), in which they

described how young children reveal their personalities through choice of color, shapes, and media.[42] Another important work of the late-forties was Elizabeth Dubin's study of drawing development in preschoolers, in which she described five stages of graphic representation.[43] Dubin's hypothesis that development of drawing skill can be influenced through instruction is a significant idea for art education. Twenty-five years later a controversy still exists as to the extent to which artistic development is an automatic consequence of maturation and the degree of intervention through instruction that should be exercised.

Although more persuasive spokesmen for research were beginning to appear in the 1960's, there were still a number of reasons accounting for a disinterest and distrust of empirical research: most professional art educators were unfamiliar with the tools of inquiry, such as the language of the social and behavioral sciences; the application of research findings to classroom practice had not been satisfactorily demonstrated; the reports of relevant research appeared in technical journals not read widely outside the psychology profession; art educators were in the majority against formal evaluation, which was often connected with empirical study; and, the growing priority and shift of resources to science in the schools put many on the curricular defensive to "protect" the subjective character of art experience in the classroom.[44]

This last phenomenon, the rejection of research and science in order to emphasize the singularity of art, may have had some unfortunate consequences for art education in general. For example, it may have impaired the argument for more art education in the councils of school administrators, at a time when the pervasive influence of the social sciences reached every level of American education, and empirical demonstration of program efficiency was often demanded. It also

has contributed to a "preciousness" and elitism among some that automatically excludes anything smacking of scientism or structure in curriculum.[45] Finally, the rejection of research may have hardened attitudes about opening up the field to new ideas, tools, and procedures borrowed from other disciplines.

Although the polarization persists, research made tremendous strides during the last fifteen years in art education. As research became increasingly important in the design of all educational programs, and researchers in art education assumed positions of leadership in the field, the amount of activity and influence grew. Several factors are responsible: the growth of degree programs,[46] the influx into the discipline of persons with social and behavioral science backgrounds,[47] the establishment of a research journal (Studies in Art Education), increasing attendance at research sessions at professional conferences,[48] and new federal and foundation support.[49]

THE CHILD AS ARTIST: IMPACT OF THE PROGRESSIVE ERA

By 1920 many of the institutions and forms of political, economic and social life were undergoing change. A war-weary world sought to break the bonds with the past which had composed the stage for the Great Conflict and the aftermath of social upheaval. Emprie was out of fashion, and waves of immigrants seeking a better life in America poured from war-torn Europe. The schools were usually ill-equipped to deal with the flood of first and second generation immigrant children. The automobile was revolutionizing the daily affairs of American life, and Prohibition and other social reform movements, such as the settlement houses, provided a backdrop for bringing down the curtain on Victorian manners and morals. Prosperity and the growth of the consumer economy in the post-War years signaled more goods and more leisure for millions of Americans. The cities

were exciting, bustling places, as the movement from the farms accelerated. School children began to attend classes in those now-gray and dilapidated block-houses which replaced "little red" from the Common Schools era.

As art education celebrated its fiftieth anniversary, school programs were being shaped primarily by the three influences previously described: the industrial orientation, philosophical connections between beauty and morality ("picture study-art appreciation"), and the psychological underpinnings for rationales of leisure and mental health. An increasingly practical spirit required the evolution of still broader rationales for inclusion of art in the curriculum.

One of these became "correlation", based on the "project method" organized by William Heard Kilpatrick, a disciple of John Dewey. Under this system the curriculum consisted of problems which demanded the application of tools and procedures from many disciplines. Art was now justified as a correlated activity, a way of relating to the rest of the curriculum.[50] Social studies units, for example, would include an "art component"; if the project was to study ancient Rome, the children might build a model of the city to utilize art in understanding the topic of Rome.[51] The pages of School Arts, edited by Henry Turner Bailey, were filled with suggestions for combining art curricula with other subject-fields; as late as the 1950's some art educators proposed activities which would "visualize and vitalize, for pupils, the facts they have mastered". Now art was in the service of concept formation.[52]

The "project method" paved the way for an even broader rationale for art in the school, the theoretical framework of progressive art education. No single force has had as lasting and profound influence on art in the schools as the development in American education of the Progressive Era. This movement, with

roots in the nineteenth century and representing a larger progressive spirit in American society, produced in public school art the dominant orientation of the last 40 years. It was from John Dewey and other leaders of Progressive ideology that art education has taken its primary rationale, the total development of the child: physical, emotional, intellectual, spiritual and aesthetic.[53]

As the art program of the nineteenth century was in the service of industry, in the twentieth century it has found itself in aid of biology. Dewey, influenced by Darwin and William James, postulated the development of children in terms of an organism which needs a supportive environment to enlarge its capacity for experience and participate in the world in various ways. Art as Experience was written when Dewey was 74 years old, in 1934, but it remains one of the most important and fascinating books in the field.[54] Dewey's general ideas were that art as an activity and product is important when it influences human experience. Dewey deplored the isolation of the "fine arts" in museums, and believed that any experience could be aesthetic to the extent that it represented an awareness by the perceiver or experiencer of the integration of that experience within the "experiential continuum" of life. Art educators could find in Dewey's advocacy of emotional as well as intellectual growth, and in his valuing of freedom and creativity, an optimistic rationale for a child-centered curriculum in art education stressing total development.

Progressive ideology furnished many important tenets for curriculum in art education: the development of child rather than adult standards,[55] experimentation, and appreciation of the self-expressive nature of children's products. These ideas were incorporated in the major texts of art education, the most important of which was Viktor Lowenfeld's Creative and Mental Growth, first

published in 1947.[56] Lowenfeld postulated a psychological foundation for children's artistic development, made efforts to explain to parents and school administrators what was happening to their children in the art classroom,[57] and provided leadership for the preparation of art teachers in graduate schools.[58]

The "biological orientation" of art education in the post-World War II years is characterized by its developmental emphasis like Lowenfeld's stage theories of artistic growth. But equally important is a new interest in creativity. Art education shifted from the old concerns with drawing, art appreciation, and correlation projects to unlocking the creative powers of school children. Belle Boas articulated the creativity rationale as early as 1927;[59] in subsequent years, Margaret Mathias, Victor D'Amico, and others explained that art experience would not only facilitate the emergence of creativity in art but general creativity as well, thus once again emphasizing the instrumental nature of the art program to achieve more general ends of schooling.[60]

The progressive art educator took much from the Gestalt conception of the child as an unfolding organism seeking equilibrium, which enlarges its capactiy for experience through problem-solving exercises and enounters. Lowenfeld, Henry Schaefer-Simmern, and Rudolf Arnheim were directly influenced by such concepts: they believed that art experience expedited perceptual maturation, and the development of personality.[61] For Sir Herbert Read, too, art education was a process-oriented activity directed primarily at fostering personal growth. Read, like Dewey, also ascribed tremendous social value to art education; art experiences, especially contact with children's art from other cultures, could even be an instrument for world peace. The venerable British historian cited the mandala form in children's drawings, which Jung also noted, as evidence of the commonality of mankind as revealed through his art.[62]

The progressives had a model, then, of the child as an artist, developing into a productive, self-reliant, creative individual.[63] But how were such ambitious objectives to be achieved? The predominant strategy was to surround the child with a rich, interesting environment and permit his artistic capacities to "unfold" naturally, without interference by adults. But this philosophy, which was based less on empirical evidence than upon essentially romantic beliefs about human development,[64] let the teacher off the hook. There was little to teach; only gentle guidance and support were considered appropriate, when the child's own interests required even that. Unfortunately, many classrooms working on such a basis became little more than time-consuming (i.e. - baby-sitting?) activity centers, to which children would abandon on Friday afternoons. Progressive art education in the service of creativity and personal development often became indistinguishable from mental health art education in the service of leisure.

Also, the progressive art educators tended to be rather authoritarian about their ideas, especially in offering stage theories of artistic development which were inadequately supported by empirical evidence. There were injunctions about such things as copying, sketchbooks, and art contests, in reaction against the methods of early art education.[65] The suggestion by some newer members of the profession, in the 1950's and 1960's, of the efficacy of a more structured curriculum in art has been met with scorn by many trained during the height of the Progressive influence, when art educators wrapped themselves in a semi-mystical aura of the subjective and inviolate character of art.[66]

But the fact remains that the progressives made substantial contributions to art education. They were responsible for enlarging the role of art in the

public school towards the total development of the child.[67] They provided, through Lowenfeld, a model for scholarly inquiry. They shifted emphasis away from the narrow concern for art product to the processes taking place in artistic development and experience. They promoted the values of experimentation, free-expression, and creativity, which the successive generation of professionals continue to consider significant.[68]

Progressive art educators have also bequeathed the professional field a number of controversies. They brought into focus some key issues: What are the permissible limits of intervention? How much of artistic development is "nature" and how much is "nurture"; that is, to what extent is it a consequence of maturation, and to what extent the result of instruction? Is naturalism ever an appropriate standard for the judgment of child art? These questions continue to stir art education, almost a half-century after the appearance of Belle Boas' book.

GOVERNMENT AND ART: IN THE SERVICE OF PUBLIC CULTURE

In Walter Smith's day the federal and state governments were naturally interested in encouraging economic growth, so it was a logical measure for them to support industrial drawing in the schools. Like the businessmen who lobbied for drawing programs to supply their factories with draftsmen, government's interest was wholly economic, and had nothing to do with education, children, or art. In the nineteenth century the federal government's primary contribution to support of the industrial or manual arts, as it was sometimes called, was in the dissemination of information: the Bureau of Education published "circulars of information" and occasionally sponsored conferences.[69]

There was not, however, support for "art" in the schools until the Depression-spawned community service programs organized by the Federal Art Project. Before this time, government played an inconsequential role in the development of art programs beyond the boundaries of industrial drawing. Of course, this reflected in large measure the paucity of government interest in public culture and the arts generally (with the major exception of the public libraries). Except for architectural competitions for public buildings, and an occasional mural commission, America's artists could secure no patronage from public sources. This negative tradition had begun with the colonial painters, who had returned from their apprenticeships in Europe expecting commissions to paint historical compositions such as Benjamin West had enjoyed under George III and Jacques Louis David had been favored under Napoleon.[70] But all that awaited were minor decorative tasks, and the single commission to fill the wall panels in the Capitol Rotunda (done by John Trumbull).[71]

The Federal Government's big splash in the arts was the creation of the Federal Art Project in the 1930's. The skills and talents of America's unemployed artists, including such names as Ben Shahn, Robert Motherwell, and Mark Tobey, were utilized to decorate post offices and other public buildings with expansive murals, and working in community art projects, which often involved school children. Artists lectured, demonstrated their techniques and conducted workshops for children and adults in design and the expressive use of various media for such functional concerns as interior decorating and landscaping.[72]

The community art projects, such as the major one conducted in Owatonna, Minnesota, involved school children in such activities as poster-making, building parade floats, designing stage scenery, and beautifying schools, homes, and stores.

The objective of the project (1933-1938) was to create art activities which would be based on the natural aesthetic interests of the native population.[73] So rather than importing New York-style exhibits of avant-garde art, the community projects promoted home decoration, school and public park plantings, visually-interesting window displays in commercial areas. The lessons of Owatonna -- cooperation in developing aesthetic interests and the enhancement of the visual environment -- have not been accorded the attention they deserve. Perhaps someday urban and school planners will reexamine the strategies of the community art projects of the Thirties.[74]

Until the years of the New Deal greatly increased the power of the federal government, the operation of the public schools had been left primarily to the states. But with centralization and the growing magnitude of social and economic problems besetting the American people, Washington began to play an ever-larger role in the schools. Through the years of Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower, the budget of the Office of Education continued to grow; federal financial aid to education had been strongly recommended by presidential advisory commissions in the 1930's and 1940's.[75] The Supreme Court integration decision of 1954 extended the involvement of government to the sphere of social and moral interests in the public schools as well.

The climax of federal aid to education came in the 1960's, with the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations' legislation for such diverse interests as educational television, staff development, curriculum research, and instructional materials. Art education benefited from the plethora of federal funding as did most areas of the curriculum. A variety of programs were funded under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965) to support the establishment

of art programs, development of curriculum, and research into behavior connected with art experience. One of the educational research laboratories created by the Great Society legislation, CEMREL near St. Louis, has maintained an extensive program of research and curriculum development in aesthetic education.[76]

As the government has involved itself in social concerns and innovational programs in public schools, some art educators have responded to the new social consciousness by concentrating on art curricula for the disadvantaged, the great numbers of students in economically-depressed areas (primarily urban).[77] These youngsters, mostly from minority racial and ethnic groups, have been victimized by poor schools and inadequate programs, often designed for middle-class youngsters, with the values and interests of their own sub-cultures excluded. The art program has been one vehicle for introducing those interests into the curriculum. For example, in New York City, which has a black and Puerto Rican population in the millions, programs for the disadvantaged have included exhibitions of African art and special workshops for craft interests of the respective sub-cultures.[78]

At first art might be thought a rather unpromising direction for working with disadvantaged youth. Their conception of art is most likely that of bathroom walls, sunbathing magazines, and the dime store, and that of the artist as a "sissy".[79] Paintings have value only in terms of dollar signs. But patient and well-conceived work by teachers interested in art and in reaching these youngsters may overcome negative attitudes. Some art educators no doubt share these students' antipathy for the System, which treats both of them as second-class citizens. But art offers an opportunity, perhaps for the first time, for many of these students to express their own thoughts and feelings, without constraint on content or the pressure of competition. The art curriculum's

traditional non-verbal orientation can be put to good advantage too, by removing the usual burden of tests and grades, and concentrating on building the cultural interests and positive self-image the disadvantaged so desperately need.[80]

As we enter the 1970's, cuts in federal aid to education threaten to decimate art programs in many schools; when the funds dry up, the supply of materials, resource personnel, and special events will be abruptly diminished unless new sources for support are found. School districts everywhere are under enormous financial pressures, so the times are not propitious for new programs. But increased lobbying activity by professional art education groups,[81] and increase of support by the National Endowment for the Arts (primarily through its artist-in-residence program) and state arts councils, are likely to further cement the growing relationship between government and public school art education in coming years.[82]

APOLLO AND THE SACRED GROVE: RELATIONSHIPS WITH ARTISTS AND MUSEUMS

Professional artists have until recent times had an arms-distance relationship with art programs in the public schools. For one thing, they have resented the second-fiddle status of art programs, which have been traditionally considered a "frill" and at best "elective". Secondly, few professional artists credit their own training to the public schools, having received their "real" art education elsewhere, usually in professional art school. This can be attributed to three factors: the lack of any art program at all in many schools; the meagreness or discontinuity of programs when art is offered; and, the discouraging low valuation college admission boards have traditionally placed on art courses, making it risky for college-hopeful youths (including aspiring artists) to divert their program away from the "solids".[83]

Relationships between professional artists and the schools have actually been non-existent for most of the time art education has been in the curriculum. In elementary schools the typical want of special resource personnel, at least until recent times, has meant a closed door to artists who might have participated in classroom programs. In secondary schools specialization is not the issue, but barriers of certification to teach have usually kept professional artists out of the art classroom on any regular basis.

A notable exception was the Federal Art Project of the Depression years. Artists were brought into regular contact with children as they cooperated on community and public art projects. But this period of involvement coincided with the support of federal funds, and when those sources dried up so did most of the artist-school programs.

The lack of a historical relationship between professional artists and the public schools may be attributed most directly to the attitudes of school boards, administrators, and parents towards art. Since the arts rate a low priority in the culture generally, and the school reflects society's values, art is traditionally the most expendable part of the school program and the first to be hit by "economy" moves.[84]

Another impediment has been the conflict of life styles, between what the artist represents (in stereotype) and what's acceptable in the minds of administrators, teachers, and parents. Thus artists have been perceived by many school personnel as the progenitors of a sloppy, lazy life style, out of the mainstream of American life, and an unsuitable influence on children.[85] Art educators have not been very successful in altering this image of the artist, and only the attainment of cultural-social status, and occasional economic breakthroughs

by high-priced New York painters, may have managed to mitigate the nefarious stereotype for some people. One wonders how horrific the prospect is to contemporary American parents of being informed by their children that a career in the arts is desired.[86]

Of course, art teachers themselves, and probably a fair number of other teachers, are sometimes exhibiting or performing artists. But their work as artists is necessarily diminished to some extent by their responsibilities for teaching and contributing to the organizational life of the school. For children to be brought into contact with persons whose entire life revolves around their making art has historically been an unusual experience, with the noted exception during the Federal Art Project years. For students to meet critics or art historians has been a still rarer occasion.

Many artists, despairing of making a livelihood as an artist in a society which has never highly valued the role, become school teachers. Some find themselves often doing very non-artistic things, such as designing Globe Theatres made out of popsicle sticks for the social studies unit. Others, frustrated by the lack of administrative support, paucity of materials, and insufficient scheduling for art, leave the public school and try to pick up teaching in private art schools where they can attend full time to art. Still others stay in the system, maintaining their own integrity as artists and continuing to produce, while working slowly and patiently for the improvement of their programs and an enlarged role for art in the school.[87]

Once again, as in the 1930's, only massive federal and state funds poured into art education has been responsible for bringing professional artists into the schools: Artists-in-residence programs, conceived and supported under the

Title III programs of the Johnson years, and by the National Endowment for the Arts. For example, one major program, designed by the CEMREL educational research laboratory, is based on three assumptions: first, that only if young people have an opportunity to see and work with artists can they grow to respect and be engaged by the kind of work done in the arts; second, that apprenticeship is a valuable model for learning new interests and acquiring skills; and third, that such a program might help break down the barriers of school life which have relegated the arts to a second-class status in the curriculum.[88]

The relationship between museums and school art education programs has been similarly tenuous. Many large museums have had, for some time, an "education person", but the role has been preoccupied with providing activities at the museum, such as Saturday workshops and docent tours, rather than any kind of interrelated programs involving the schools. Indeed, art educators know very little about the effect of museum experiences on children and how programs could be developed that appeal to students.

Museums have generally been places quite inappropriate for young children, for they, like other institutions, highly prize the discipline and quiet which is so difficult for young and excited children to maintain.[89] Especially constraining has been the "don't touch" rule in most places, but now in some museums children are encouraged to touch sculpture and work out their own relationship with the art objects they confront. Also inefficacious has been the procedure in which children are introduced to the museum and its contents: being marched in front of pictures and lectured to is not likely to generate interest or teach anything worth retaining about art.

Museums have tried various approaches to working with the schools. In San Francisco a PTA-sponsored program enables students to choose a work of art from the museum rental gallery to take back to their school to hang in a place of honor. The Metropolitan in New York has a service which provides subscribing school districts with various exhibits and materials.[90] Other museums offer demonstrations by artists, rooms for exhibits of public school art, tours and workshops, loan of pictures and reproductions. But much needs to be done; at a recent conference on Museums and the Schools in New York City, it was clear from the dialogue that the coordination needed between school and museum will require, in the museums, people who know more about schools, and in the schools, people who know more about museums.

THE PERCOLATION OF TASTE: FAD, FASHION, AND CONTEMPORARY ART

Museums educate taste, and in that capacity might have developed a significant role in school curriculum. But the education of taste has never been a central objective of the American public schools, partly because of the amorphous nature of such a concern, but also due to the belief that such matters are more properly a responsibility of home and community. While styles in architecture, home furnishings, clothing, and other cultural interests metamorphosized rapidly, public schools before the first world war gave only peripheral attention to these changes, usually within the contexts of a social studies unit or home economics. But a likely jurisdiction for matters of taste, the art curricula, hardly touched upon fad, fashion, and contemporary art. Art educators often made, like some administrators, pious salaams to the objective of inculcating taste, but usually retreated in practice to narrowly-conceived programs of drawing instruction and to a lesser extent art appreciation.

Actually, the schools were teaching quite a bit about taste, in the indirect sense of surrounding students with an environment which was almost always inordinately anaesthetic.[91] Insensitivity to the function of the school as an aesthetic model, one in which young people spent considerable years staring at pale walls and dark halls, may have had its effect in helping produce generations of citizens who cared little about the aesthetic qualities of their neighborhoods, communities, and public buildings. In any case, the art classroom, paradoxically, often failed to serve as an oasis of visual example, pleasure and interest in the non-aesthetic environment of the school.[92]

Besides disinterest, and the hypocrisy study of taste might represent in the typical school setting, educators regarded the acquisition of "tastes" an inappropriate function for the public school, with its egalitarian philosophy. Reading and spelling involved established rules, but who would decide the canons of taste which the school ought to promulgate? That was the job of parents, or fancy finishing schools; anyway, only the Vanderbilts could worry about adaptations of Georgian or French Renaissance architecture, or whether flowered-carpets were "in" for summer homes. The magazines and newspapers of the late nineteenth century advertised a good life which only a relatively small number of Americans could afford. Good taste was expensive, and in most of the homes of public school children little thought could be given to acquiring chateau residences, Saville Row suits, or Louis XVI saltcellars.[93]

Of course, the average American family had its fads and fashions as well, although obviously less extravagant: Currier & Ives prints instead of Gainsborough portraits, dimestore porcelain rather than Meissen. Unfortunately, art educators were unable to develop programs centered around even these more

proletarian tastes; schools remained closed to learnings which did not fit within the traditional subject matter areas, and in art these parameters permitted little more than some studio-type activity and perhaps a smattering of art appreciation.

Art education finally turned to the theme of art as a component of daily culture in the late 1920's and throughout the 1930's, when the art "projects" and correlation programs were popular.[94] An interest in art for everyday life manifest itself in a new emphasis on a wide spectrum of utilitarian functions, from personal grooming to interior decoration and urban planning. Such matters as the setting of a visually-attractive dinner table, or the decor of one's living room, became topics within the jurisdiction of the art program, primarily at the high school level.[95] Art educators began to talk more about furniture; weaving, and jewelry, and generally to broaden consideration of the "visual arts" to include matters of taste.[96]

The thrust in art programs towards a general knowledge of art for daily living had a vocational motive as well. Students who had learned to use principles of design, and had discriminating judgment, would presumably find employment more quickly in stores, hotels, restaurants, beauty parlors, and other places where good taste was of value.[97] In the elementary schools students were occupied in essentially craft-type activities in which that "general knowledge" of art could be acquired and taste refined. From the art classroom spewed a flood of book braces, candlesticks, doilies, flower pots, pot holders, picture frames, pincushions, and tie racks.[98] This was the climax of the "ashtray movement" in art education, but it often seemed to betray taste rather than represent it well.[99]

As to the influence of contemporary art, throughout the "picture study" years and early "art appreciation", little or no attention was given to the

exciting new forms being created in Europe. Of course, one would hardly expect the schools at this time to reflect a consciousness which was still absent in the culture generally. Americans did not awaken to the new developments in art history until the New York Armory Show of 1913, and even then so much critical reaction was outraged and conservative that the works of Cezanne or Braque were hardly likely to penetrate the public school classroom.[100]

But "modern art" had been exhibited in the United States for some years before the Armory Show, chiefly by Alfred Steiglitz at his famous 291 Gallery in New York City. The 291 also showed children's art, one of the first galleries to do so, and championed new media (such as photography) and the values of personal expression, imagination and interpretation. American architects, such as Louis Sullivan and Frank Lloyd Wright, argued for the development of nativistic, organic styles which would reflect the American consciousness of technology and modernism. Thus the initial influence of modern art upon education was its implicit valuing of the same rationales that the Progressive era in art education embraced: personal freedom, interpretation, and creativity.

Throughout the decades of the first half of this century "art appreciation" in the classroom consisted of posting an English landscape or a scene of an important event in American history on the bulletin board, reciting a bland liturgy of the print's statistics, and leaving the "masterpiece" to work its inspirational powers on the students, presumably by its mere presence since support materials and follow-up activities were virtually non-existent. But in the post-World War II expansion of educational technology, color reproductions became more common, and eventually such instructional support materials as slides, filmstrips, and art history books written especially for young people were available to the schools.[101]

Also after the war, the vision of nativistic styles was fulfilled in the rise of abstract expressionism, perhaps the first original American painting style. This was a convenient development for art education, since the spatterings and distortions of form of abstract expressionism, if looked at in a terribly simplified way, often reminded one of the first proto-artistic splashings and scribblings of children.[102] Parents who worried about the vague or non-existent subject-matter in their child's "abstract paintings" were told, "Don't worry, you don't have to see anything in them".[103]

An important offshoot of the abstract art influence was the "scrap materials" movement of the 1940's and 1950's. Designed to encourage experimentation and "free expression", the teacher brought into the classroom a variety of materials and odds and ends: pieces of irregular-shaped wood, cloth, sponge, paper, corrugated cardboard, spools, rubber hose, etc. Scrap materials were then transformed, through activities in collage and sculpture, into "art". These activities were representative of a certain facet of Progressive art education, which held that the child ought to be surrounded by diverse and interesting materials, and permitted to explore and do with them what he will. But they also represented art education at its peak of neglect of significant intellectual content.[104]

In recent years a new responsiveness to the currents of modern art has characterized some art classrooms.[105] Reproductions of modern works, or actual paintings, hang on some school walls.[106] Material supply firms make a wide array of instructional support media available, from kits which train visual perception to elaborate slide-book series with records, slides, loops and background reading. Of course, "Washington Crossing the Delaware" remains stan-

dard fare in other classrooms, where the "holiday-centered" (i.e. - Thanksgiving turkeys) and project curriculum of a quarter-century ago continues in effect.[107]

During the 1960's a new and potentially exciting dimension to school art programs, especially at the secondary level, has been added by a further widening of definition and jurisdiction as to what constitutes "contemporary art". Study of the mass media has become a popular focus in many art programs. The Age of McLuhan: communications theory, film, advertising, and graphic design. "Art environments" saturate student's lives: the juke box, movies, comic books, television. The implications for education of taste are enormous: the mass media shape our preferences and judgments, from the way we dress to how we decorate our living and working spaces. If, therefore, the mass media is an appropriate focus for art education then the import of the art program becomes more self-evident, in an era when school curriculum can no longer exist in a vacuum separated from the meaningful contexts, events, and influences in young people's lives.

* * * * *

- FOOTNOTES -

1. Thomas Woody (editor), Educational Views of Benjamin Franklin, New York: McGraw Hill, 1934, pg. 27.

2. Horace Mann writes in the Common School Journal, VI, April 15, 1844, 132-35: "In the course of my tour, I passed from countries where almost every pupil in every school could draw with ease, and most of them with no inconsiderable degree of beauty and expression . . . I came to the conclusion that, with no other guide than a mere inspection of the copybooks of the pupils, I could tell whether drawing were taught in the school or not; so uniformly superior was the handwriting in those schools where drawing was taught in connection with it."

3. Drawing had been obligatory in the lower grades in Boston since 1864, in large part due to the leadership of John Dudley Philbrick, Superintendent for almost two decades. Harry Beck Green, The Introduction of Art As a General Education Subject in American Schools, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1948.

4. Americans faced stiff competition in world markets from European manufactures. This became especially apparent at the exhibitions of industrial products at the various world fairs of the nineteenth century, including London (1851), Paris (1867), Vienna (1873) and the two in the United States, Philadelphia (1876) and Chicago (1893). The Chicago Fair featured children's art and displays of craft products from manual arts workshops in the public schools.

5. Boston: Charles Osgood & Co., 1873. Smith's career as State Director of Art Education for Massachusetts, and as principal of Massachusetts Normal Art School, was a tempestuous one. His personality and his professional beliefs aroused much hostility, especially among those who thought drawing in the schools a waste of time. See Harry Beck Green, "Walter Smith: the Forgotten Man," Art Education, 19 (Jan. 1966), 3-9.

   One graduate of Massachusetts Normal Art, who graduated in 1900 (Smith had returned to England in 1883), was paid $500 a year for teaching drawing in Boston. Her father asked her: "Do you really get paid for teaching children to draw?" The story is related by Helen Cleaves, in Ruth Ebken (editor), 1910-1960: Prospect and Retrospect, Kutztown, Pa.: Eastern Arts Association, 1961, p. 43.

6. Green, op. cit., p. 280-1. Manual arts, and its relation to business and labor movements in the late nineteenth century, is described astutely in the chapter on "Education and Industry" in Lawrence Cremin, The Transformation of the School, New York: Vintage, 1961, p. 23-57.

7. In 1909 the Eastern Arts Association combined with the Eastern Manual Training Teachers Association. Henry Turner Bailey, the editor of School Arts, was the first President, and the organization had a membership of 662. Royal Bailey Farnum, "The Story of the Eastern Arts Association", in Ebken (ed.), op. cit., p. 11-25.

8. Green, op. cit., 289-90, suggests that art education turned to the fine arts, as represented by picture study, because the manual arts movement usurped the original raison d'etre of mechanical drawing for vocation preparation. Also see James Parton Haney (editor), Art Education in the Public Schools of the United States, New York: American Art Annual, 1908, p. 55-6, 59.

9. The establishment of drawing in the curriculum remained controversial even after it was mandated by Massachusetts in 1870. The anti-drawing faction claimed it belonged in "fashionable academy education", not in the public schools. The state law provided no penalties for non-compliance by local school boards. By 1902, 43% of Massachusetts' high schools still lacked drawing or art curriculum. Green, op. cit., 97-8.

10. For documents of the industrial drawing period, such as speeches by Walter Smith, reports of state commissioners of education, and government bulletins regarding vocational training, the most comprehensive source is Isaac Edwards Clarke (editor), Art and Industry, Education in the Industrial and Fine Arts in the United States, Part I (1885), Part II (1892), Part III (1897), Bureau of Education, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

    Also see Charles Alpheus Bennett, History of Manual and Industrial Education, Up to 1870 (1926), 1870-1917 (1937),Peoria, Ill.: Manual Arts Press.

11. Other early drawing systems: Wiliam Bently Fowle, An Introduction to Linear Drawing, Boston: Hilliard, Little & Williams, 1830,and The Eye and the Hand, Boston: W. B. Fowle, 1847; William Minifie, A Textbook of Geometrical Drawing, Boston: Hilliard, Little & Williams, 1830; Rembrandt Peale, Graphics, Philadelphia: Biddle Publishing Co., 1835.

12. Mann, Philbrick, and Smith were opposed every step of the way by elitists, who argued that drawing was a fine art, a luxury reserved for the upper classes. Green, op. cit., p. 73-5.

13. Elizabeth Peabody, Plea for Froebel's Kindergarten as the First Grade of Primary Art Education, Boston, 1870. Also her Lectures in the Training Schools for Kingergartners, Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1893, especially Lecture IV, p. 75-88.

14. Froebel himself may have initiated the use of coloring books, now considered passé in art education. See Frederick Froebel, The Education of Man, W. N. Hailman (trans.), New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1826.

15. Peabody's Lectures are filled with references to the Infinite Cause, Heavenly Father, the Immutable Reality of the Loving Creator, etc.

16. Elizabeth Peabody, Record of Mr. Alcott's School (3rd ed. rev.), Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1874. Also, see Robert Saunders, The Contributions of Horace Mann, Mary Peabody Mann, and Elizabeth Peabody to Art Education in the United States, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1961.

17. John Stuart Mill, Inaugural Address (2nd. ed.), University of St. Andrews, London: Longmans, Green, Reader & Dyer, 1867.

18. Picture Study in the schools drew its lead from the advocacy of Charles Eliot Norton, the first American Professor of Art History (Harvard, 1874). Norton wrote that "there can be nothing of greater importance in education than the culture of the love of beauty" (p. 346). "The Educational Value of the Fine Arts", Educational Review, April 1895, p. 343-8.

19. Andrew Mellon, for example, paid over one million dollars for Raphael's Alba Madonna, and over $825,000 for Boticelli's Adoration of the Magi. It is estimated that Mellon spent on his collection (now in the National Gallery) almost $20 million, more than a half-century ago (i.e. - multiply the value of the dollar several times!)

20. For more on use of prints and reproductions, see Oscar Neale, Picture Study in the Grades, Milwaukee: O.W. Neale Press, 1927. These pictures might have had some value in building up information about art, but it is doubtful that they contributed to development of artistic sensitivity. The quality of the reproductions was low, and the subject matter usually insipid or irrelevant to the children's lives. "A passively respectful observation of these mature art products was not sufficient to stir childhood's imaginative and creative impulses." Harold Rugg and Ann Shumaker, The Child-Centered School, Yonkers, N.Y.: World Book Co., 1928, p. 212-13.

21. G. W. F. Hegel, Philosophy of Fine Art (4 vols.), F. P. B. Osmaston (trans.), London, 1920. Hegel's aesthetics was first published in 1835, four years after his death.

22. The first U. S. Commissioner of Education, Henry Barnard (who, like Horace Mann, left the legal profession for education), also had espoused the cause of art education. In the early 1840's, while leading a reform movement in the Connecticut schools, he said in many speeches throughout the New England states that "a disastrous omission in the public schools is Drawing." Quoted in Green, op. cit., p. 85-6.

23. Even in kindergarten Harris thought these fundamental paradigms could be perceived and understood. They would emerge out of the activities of the classroom, such as weaving, modelling in clay, and drawing. William Tormey Harris, Psychologic Foundations of Education, New York; D. Appleton & Co., 1898, p. 315-6.

24. Discussion of the type-form blocks, the influence of the World Fairs on industrial drawing, and other factors in early art education: see Frederick Logan, The Growth of Art in American Schools, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955.

25. Appreciation could also be developed, it was claimed, by attending to the visual quality of ordinary objects in the child's own environment, and by stressing the beauty of the outdoors during "nature study". Sallie Tannahill, Fine Arts for Public School Administrators, New York: Teachers College Columbia, 1932, p. 60-5.

26. Arthur Wesley Dow, "The Theory and Practice of Teaching Art", Teachers College Record 9 (May 1908) 1-54. The article is illustrated with some of the plates Dow used for training. Also, see his major text, Composition (9th ed. rev.), New York : Doubleday, Page & Co., 1920. It was originally published in 1899.

27. For more on Arthur Wesley Dow, see William Whitford, An Introduction to Art Education, New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1929, p. 101+. For a critical assessment, see Thomas Munro, "The Dow Method and Public School Art", Journal of the Barnes Foundation, January 1926.

28. Earl Barnes (editor), Studies in Education, vol. 2 no. 1, Philadelphia: Child Study Association, 1902.

29. Sigmund Freud, Interpretation of Dreams, New York: Macmillan, 1933.

30. Some resemblance could be postulated between the emotionalism, distortions, and exaggerations of children's art and the character of the new radical movements of Fauvism, Expressionism, and Cubism.

31. For a contemporary extension of Dewey's ideas, which emphasizes the cognitive aspect of artistic experience, see David Ecker, "The Artistic Process as Qualitative Problem Solving," Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, 21 (Spring 1963) 283-90. Also, see Rudolf Arnheim, Visual Thinking, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

32. The "custodial" function is often associated with the "leisure rationale". In other words, the "leisure" is primarily for the adults in the school! One writer suggested that drawing on slates was useful for children because it "occupies and amuses their idle hours, and keeps them still". Bennett, Up to 1870, op. cit., 436.

33. Thomas Munro, "The Psychological Approach to Art and Art Education", Art in American Life and Education, Guy Whipple (editor), 40th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941, p. 249-88.

34. Margaret Naumberg, The Child and The World, New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1928. A more recent work of Naumberg's is Schizophrenic Art: Its Meaning in Psychotherapy, New York, 1950.

35. The function of drawing as a non-verbal language had been suggested by John Locke and Benjamin Franklin. But the first American art educator to give considerable attention to the theory was Walter Sargent, Professor of Aesthetic and Industrial Education at the University of Chicago. Sargent, whose ideas were really ahead of his time, called drawing "a tool with which to think". Walter Sargent, Fine and Industrial Arts in Elementary Schools, Boston: Ginn & Co., 1912. Also, see his book with Elizabeth Miller, How Children Learn to Draw, Boston: Ginn & Co., 1916.

36. The best summary of the early studies about children's drawings is in Dale Harris, "Historical Survey of the Study of Children's Drawings", in Children's Drawings as Measures of Intellectual Maturity, New York: Harcourt-Brace-World, 1963, p. 10-36.

    Another useful review of research on children's drawings is Elliot Eisner, "Research on the Development of Child Art", in A Comparison of the Developmental Drawing Characteristics of Culturally Advantaged and Culturally Disadvantaged Children, Project O. E. 6-10-027, U.S. Office of Education, 1967, p. 21-31.

37. Elliot Eisner, "The New Rationality in Art Education: Promise or Pitfall?", Art Education, 22 (Feb. 1969) 6.

38. Florence Goodenough, The Measurement of Intelligence in Drawings, Chicago: World Book Co., 1926.

39. Dale Harris, op. cit.

40. Ebken, op. cit., p. 18.

41. Viktor Lowenfeld, "Tests for Visual and Haptical Aptitudes", American Journal of Psychology, 58 (1945) 100-05.

42. Rose Alschuler and La Berta Hattwick, A Study of Painting and Personality of Young Children, 2 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947. See also, by the same authors, "Easel Painting as an Index of Personality in Preschool Children", American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 13 (1943) 616-25.

43. Elizabeth Dubin, "The Effect of Training on the Tempo of Development of Graphic Representation in Preschool Children", Journal of Experimental Education, 15 (Dec. 1946) 166-73.

44. There has been considerable dialogue in art education's professional journals about the feasibility, desirability, and reliability of research in the field. The merits and problems of research are debated in Victor D'Amico, "Art Education Today: Millenium or Mirage?", Art Education, 19 (May 1966) 27-32; and, Elliot Eisner, "Art Education Today: Neither Millenium nor Mirage," Art Education, 19 (Oct. 1966) 4-8.

    Another important exchange was Carl Larson, "Search and Research", Art Education, 19 (Mar. 1966) 27-8; and, Arthur Efland & David Templeton, "Research and Anti-Research Motives in Art Education", Art Education, 19 (Dec. 1966), 18-19.

45. "The art educator ... has actually given himself superior airs, as a person too sanctified by knowledge of the aesthetic mysteries for the common touch of mankind." Lester Dix, "Aesthetic Experience and Growth in Life and Education," Teachers College Record, 40 (Dec. 1938) 206-21.

46. Elliot Eisner, "Graduate Study and the Preparation of Scholars in Art Education", Art Education, Reid Hastie (editor), 64th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 2, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965, p. 274-98.

47. Perhaps a sign of growing sophistication in research has been the gradual growth in participation by art educators at the conferences of the American Educational Research Association. One art educator, Professor Elliot Eisner of Stanford University, was honored in 1967 with the A.E.R.A.'s Palmer O. Johnson Memorial Award.

48. Research conferences independent of the state and national professional organization conventions have also been held. For example, see A Seminar in Art Education for Research and Curriculum Development, Cooperative Research Project V-002, Edward Mattil (director), University Park, Pa.: The Pennsylvania State University, 1966.

49. An excellent summary of government-sponsored projects up to 1968 is to be found in Stanley Madeja, "Art and Government: A Review of Activities and Projects in the Visual Arts Supported by the Arts and Humanities Program", Art Education, 22 (March 1968) 20-3.

    Private philanthropy has also become a source for research and curriculum development in art education. Among projects of recent years have been the Kettering Foundation and Mead Corporation programs at the School of Education, Stanford University, and the three pilot projects in New York State and Missouri sponsored by the JDR III Fund.

50. "Through correlation and efficient cooperation, art work becomes a 'helping hand', a kind of connecting link that binds all subjects to it and makes every study at school more interesting and valuable." Whitford, op. cit. 3.

    Also about this time Franklin Bobbitt was developing his curriculum objectives, in How To Make a Curriculum, Boston, 1924. Some art educators utilized these as a way of installing the visual arts within the same framework of goals as other subject-areas. See Fredrik Nyguist, Art Education in the Elementary Schools, University Research Monograph No. 8, Baltimore: Warwick & York, 1929, p. 27+.

51. Correlation projects had a simplistic character which sublimated almost entirely the interests of art, such as a critical concern for visual qualities, to the interests of the "topic". For example, some of the units of study reviewed in one text include "From Pulp to Christmas Cards" and "Learning to Choose Healthful Luncheons". Margaret Glade, Art in the Integrated Program, Nashville, Tenn.: Cullom & Ghertner, N.D.

52. Dawn Schneider, Correlated Art, Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Co., 1951. A major textbook of the height of the correlation era in art education is Walter Klar, Leon Winslow, and C. Valentine Kirby, Art Education in Principle and Practice, Springfield, Mass,: Milton Bradley Co., 1933.

53. A fascinating and insightful educational history of the Progressive Era is Cremin's Transformation of the School, op. cit. He traces out the complex matrix of forces in the public schools and society which made the three-quarters of a century movement one of the most exciting periods of change in American education.

54. John Dewey, Art as Experience, New York: Minton, Balch & Co., 1934. The key chapter relating Dewey's interest in art to progressive ideology is chapter 3, "Having an Experience". See also his "Experience, Nature and Art", Art and Education, Barnes Foundation Press, 1929, p. 3-12.

55. Rigid notions of what children's art ought to look like were held by many before the Progressives championed the integrity of child art. For example, a professor of fine arts, at Teachers College, wrote in 1900: "If there is one thing certain, it would seem to be this: that, as the child advances in maturity, he must cease to draw like a child . . . at fourteen he should have learned to put away childish things, and draw very much like a man". Alfred Churchill, "Fine Arts", Teachers College Record, 1 (Nov. 1900) 315.

56. Viktor Lowenfeld, Creative and Mental Growth, (5th ed.), New York: MacMillan, 1970. Also, see Lowenfeld's The Nature of Creative Activity (2nd ed.), London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1952.

57. Viktor Lowenfeld, Your Child and His Art, New York: MacMillan, 1954.

58. For a discussion of early influences on Lowenfeld, see Robert Saunders, "The Contributions of Viktor Lowenfeld to Art Education", Studies in Art Education, 2 (Fall 1960) 6-15. A companion article appears in a later issue of Studies, 2 (Spring 1961) 7-13.

59. Belle Boas, Art in the School, New York: Doubleday Co., 1927.

60. Margaret Mathias, The Teaching of Art, New York: Scribner, 1932; Victor D'Amico, Creative Teaching in Art, Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Co., 1942.

61. Lowenfeld, op. cit.; Henry Schaefer-Simmern, The Unfolding of Artistic Activity, Berekeley: University of California Press, 1948; Rudolf Arnheim, Art and Visual Perception, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1954. Especially see chapter 4, "Growth:, in which Arnheim describes the process of "perceptual differentiation" operating in children when they draw and paint.

62. Herbert Read, Education Through Art (2nd ed.), New York: Pantheon Books, 1945. Read was a world-renowned art critic, historian, and educator. His many books on art include The Philosophy of Modern Art, New York: Horizon Press, 1953, and The Grass Roots of Art, New York: Wittenborn, 1955.

63. See Daniel Mendelowitz, Children are Artists (2nd ed.), Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1963. D'Amico has clarified the concept of the child as an artist: "(it) implies that every child is a potential creator . . . It does not claim that every child will become an accomplished artist or produce great masterpieces". D'Amico, op. cit. 1.

64. "Romantic" is not used here in any pejorative sense. Its reference in the context of the Progressives is to Rousseauian naturalism.

65. "When Ruth Paison Shaw in 1931 added the rainbow to mud pies and thus perfected finger paints, she completed a pendulum swing in art education from one extreme to another. The free, emotional, subjective expression encouraged by finger painting was the antithesis of the accurate, geometric, objective results sought by the first American art educators . . . Between these two extremes lies the history of art education in American public schools." Green, op. cit. 190.

66. For example: "(Teachers of art) can show men how to attain liberation from distraction in a vision of the immediate, how to lift their heads above the flux and enjoy union with the eternal, how to achieve the bliss of beauty, the rapture of fulfillment, the ecstasy of love." Arthur Goddard, "Training the Aesthetic Capacity", High Points, 30 (Jan. 1948) 68-9.

    Another writer mentions, in speaking about Lowenfeld's widespread infuence, that his ideas were "until recently unchallenged". Mary Adeline McKibbin, "Fifty Years of Theory and Practice", in Ebken, op. cit., 62-79.

67. The Progressives were ambitious. One writer, in speaking of the "appreciative and creative person" it was the task of the art program to develop, cites as objectives: "extreme awareness, independence, self-confidence, self-control, self-discipline, profound analytical and critical capacity, free emotional responsiveness, genuine humility, disinterestedness, faith in the potentiality of mankind". Rosabell MacDonald, Art as Education: The Study of Art in the Secondary Schools, New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1941, p. 74-5.

68. An excellent compilation of research in creativity related to art education, including a contribution by Lowenfeld and others trained by the Progressives, is W. Lambert Brittain (editor), Creativity and Art Education, Washington, D.C.: National Art Education Association, n.d.

69. Manual arts did become the focus of a congressional commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, in 1914. Their findings of the utility of shop training and industrial arts in the schools for future employment resulted in the Smith-Hughes Bill in 1917. Cremin, op. cit. 23-57.

    There were other kinds of support, sometimes very indirect, for industrial drawing in the public schools. High-placed officials, such as Henry Barnard and William Tormey Harris, supported drawing in the curriculum. Also, a certain government sponsorship was involved in the creation of World Fairs (Chicago, 1893; St. Louis, 1904) in the United States, where children's drawings and the products of public school manual arts classes were displayed.

70. Americans could often do better in Europe. Bemjamin West, John Singleton Copley, James McNeill Whistler were among those expatriates who garnered steady commissions in England while their artist friends back in the States struggled to eke out a living from their art. See Neil Harris, The Artist in American Society, New York: Braziller, 1966.

    Also, for discussion of the expatriates and the trans-Atlantic commute many American artists found necessary to become sufficiently trained, see E. P. Richardson, A Short History of Painting in America, New York: Thomas Crowell Co., 1963.

71. Suzanne La Follette, Art in America, New York: W.W. Norton, 1929.

72. See Holger Cahill, "The Federal Art Project", New Horizons in American Art, H. Cahill (editor), New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1936.

73. Edwin Ziegfeld, "The Owatonna Art Education Project", Western Arts Association Bulletin, 20 (1936) 54-8. For a general description of the larger ramifications, see Edgar Bruce Wesley, Owatonna: The Social Development of a Minnesota Community, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1938.

74. Another overlooked source of information about art curricula in the 1930's and the possibilities that were considered is the P.E.A: Wilford Merton Aikin, The Story of the Eight-Year Study , New York: Harper & Bros., 1942, p. 70-2. Also, Gordon Plummer, "Unclaimed Legacy: The Eight-Year Study", Art Education, 22 (May 1969) 5-6.

75. Professional organizations were active too. The Educational Policies Committee of the National Education Association issued a statement in 1945 urging federal participation, to aid states in improving the quality of American public school education.

76. Among CEMREL's publications: Manuel Barkan, Laura Chapman, and Evan Kern, Guidelines: Curriculum Development for Aesthetic Education, St. Louis: Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory, 1970.

77. See Doris Barclay, "Dissemination and Implementation of Research on Art Education for the Disadvantaged Child", Art Education, 22 (May 1969) 23-4; Francis Heussenstamm (editor), "Digest and Review: A Seminar on the Role of the Arts in Meeting the Social and Educational Needs of the Disadvantaged", Studies in Art Education, 11 (Fall 1969) 34-43.

78. An excellent overview is provided in Judith Murphy and Ronald Gross, The Arts and the Poor: New Challenge for Educators, Washington, D. C.: Office of Education, 1968. Art for understanding between those sub-cultures is discussed in Arthur Newman, "Promoting Intercultural Understanding Through Art", Art Education, 23 (Jan. 1970) 18-20.

79. Harold Cohen, "Learning Stimulation," Art Education, 22 (Mar. 1969) 2-8. The stereotype of effeminacy has been one of the more subtle burdens which school art programs have carried: "The male high-school teacher of music or drawing still labors under the suspicion of effeminacy; chemistry is a far more manly subject." (underline mine) This was written in 1928, but the situation is little different today. R. Duffus, The American Renaissance, New York: Alfred Knopf, 1928.

80. See the six articles in the series, "Art for the Disadvantaged Child," in Art Education, from October 1968 to May 1969. Also, The Use of Art in Compensatory Education Projects, An Inventory, Robert Hess (director), Chicago: Urban Child Center, University of Chicago, 1966.

81. For a brief review of the founding of the modern professional organization in the field, the National Art Education Association, see Robert Saunders, "N.A.E.A.: An Excursion into the Past," Art Education, 19 (Jan. 1966) 21-4. Art educators were first recognized with their own department within the National Education Association in 1894.

    Political and lobbying activity by art educators is discussed in two highly engaging articles by contributors from outside the discipline: Harold Cohen, "Art Power: A Proposition," Studies in Art Education, 9 (Spring 1968) 78-86; Melvin Tumin, "Procedures for Effecting Educational Change," Art Education, 21 (Jan. 1967) 7-14.

82. The most spectacular success story is that of the New York State Council on the Arts, which sponsors many exhibition and visiting artist programs in public schools. Their budget in 1966 was about $1,500,000; in 1970, they will be spending about $20 million, an amount equal to the funds the National Endowment for the Arts has been appropriated for supporting the arts at the federal level in all 50 states.

    A comprehensive review of the National Endowment's program is furnished in Judith Gault (editor), Federal Funds and Services for the Arts, Washington, D.C.: National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, 1967.

83. "College and University Acceptance of High School Art Credits for Admission," Art Education, 21 (Oct. 1968) 31-8.

84. In an extensive survey in which both lay citizens and educators were asked to rank the relative importance of sixteen subject areas, aesthetic development was placed fourteenth by the general public and twelfth by teachers and administrators. Lawrence Downey, The Task of Public Education: The Perceptions of People, Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1960.

    Low valuation is revealed, of course, in the extent and character of art programs in the schools. A 1963 survey found that in high schools offering art only 15% of the students elected to take advantage, and that only 1 out of 10 high schools required a course in art for graduation. A telling fact about the elementary schools was the finding that only 1 out of 5 districts with over 6,000 pupils required some professional training in art for its teachers. Music and Art in the Public Schools, Research Monograph M-3, National Education Association, Washington, D.C.: N.E.A., 1963.

85. "Society ... looked upon the artist as a social oddity, a creature set apart, marked, something special and, too often, a little precious. He became in the public eye a stereotype: a slovenly-dressed, long-haired, impractical dreamer; an effeminate, amoral, parasitic dawdler; something of an exotic in taste, surroundings and contributions. He was by no means to be taken seriously by men of solid worth, most of whom deemed him of doubtful value to a work-a-day society." Green, op.cit., p.275.

86. One wonders how consoled parents of would-be artists were upon reading Lowenfeld's injunction to them in Your Child and His Art, op.cit.: "It is indeed unfortunate that so very few artists in the United States can earn a living through their art products. This should, however, by no means be the determining factor for parents in helping their children in making their decisions." (p. 179)

87. Harry Kelley, "The Artist and Arts Education," Art Education, 22 (Apr. 1969)2-5.

88. Stanley Madeja, Nadine Meyers, Suzanne Dudley, & Jack Davis, The Artist in the School, St. Louis: Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory, 1970.

89. It is unfortunate that art educators have sometimes sanctioned this rigidity: "Classes or groups must be kept together. Pupils should not be allowed to wander about by themselves, except at such times as permission is given." Klar, Winslow, & Kirby, op. cit. p. 70.

90. The Metropolitan had as many as 91,600 persons receive instruction from museum personnel or schoolteachers back in 1931. Frederick Keppel and R. Duffus, The Arts in American Life, Recent Social Trends Monograph, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1933, p. 71. Forty years later the Education Department at the Museum could claim twice that number, with almost 5,000 children in grades 5-9 alone visiting the galleries every week. Current figures courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum.

91. "The typical schoolroom in the older type of school building is perhaps the gloomiest of all the gloomy rooms that can be seen or imagined, surrounded as it usually is on at least three sides by blackboards that are literally as well as nominally black. It is to rooms such as these that we still resign most of our children to be 'educated'. Little wonder is it that many children find school life irksome..." Leon Winslow, Organization and Teaching of Art (rev. ed.), Baltimore: Warwick & York, 1928, p. 229.

92. Elliot Eisner has pointed out the inconsistency between curriculum and setting: "While Mrs. Jones tries to help pupils feel the movement of line and space in a painting by Kandinsky, the halls display third-rate pictures and statues." "School as an Aesthetic Community," Elementary School Journal, 60 (Nov. 1959)85.

In the 1930's, when"art as a way of life" and correlation themes were popular, art educators talked of "beauty nooks" and "shrines of beauty" to dress up the dreary environments of classrooms and hallways. A Schoolroom Decoration Movement had begun with Bronson Alcott (the plaster casts), and became organized by the Boston Public School Art League, which dispensed prints and casts to the city schools. Unfortunately, as Eisner implies, these "decorations" were usually of questionable value. Green, op. cit. p. 295-304.

93. The development of American taste is related provocatively in Russell Lynes, The Tastemakers, New York: Harper & Bros., 1954.

94. Horace Walpole: "Art and life ought to be hurriedly remarried and brought to live together."

95. One textbook of the Thirties includes chapters on "Art in the Home," which contains suggestions for floor plans and the use of accessories in decorating, and "Art in Dress", which has subtitles such as "Building a Wardrobe," "Complexion," and "Personality." This last section contains such advice as the following: "The romantic type of girl is youthful, buoyant and happy. Gentleness, graciousness, charm of manner and speech, are characteristics... Soft, graceful lines made by flounces, ruffles and bows, or the crispness of tulles, organdies and taffetas build up her picturesque silhouette. Rose Collins and Olive Riley, Art Appreciation for Junior & Senior High Schools, New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1931, p. 54.

96. One of the major textbooks of the "art in daily living" era survives in contemporary art education, recently published in its 5th edition: Ray Faulkner and Edwin Ziegfeld, Art Today (5th ed.), New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.

97. Tannahill, op. cit. p. 116-18. "Taste" was an important ingredient in the Bauhaus-type curricula, which affected some high-school art programs by turning them to "design" and "problem-solving" activities.

98. Schoolrooms also became veritable toy factories: among some 93 items designated as "Handwork of Play Value" in one text, are bean bags, popguns, drums, firemen's hats, soldiers and sling-shots. The title of the textbook seems more controversial now than it did in 1923: Jane Mc Kee, Purposeful Handwork, New York: MacMillan, 1923, p. 13-77.

99. Two thoughts: "Interesting is easy; beautiful is difficult" (Gustav Mahler); "No one ever went broke underestimating the taste of the American public" (H.L. Mencken).

100. A textbook on art appreciation published in 1931 did include in its chapter on "Personalities" brief coverage of Cezanne, Van Gogh, and Gauguin, but these three were all dead by 1906, and the text ignores completely the radical restructurings of visual art by the cubists and expressionists. Collins & Riley, op. cit. p. 265-73.

101. See Orville Winsand, Art Appreciation in the Public Schools from 1930-1960, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1961.

102. "Distortions are a basic means of expression not only in child art but also in most of the expressive works of great art." Lowenfeld, Your Child and His Art, op. cit. p. 161.

103. Ibid. p. 163. An interesting crisis of values has arisen with classroom teachers over modern art: "They have looked at contemporary art with dismay because they felt that they did not understand it or that they actively disliked it. This raised a dilemma because they also felt that, since they were seeing the strange art in established art museums, they should like it. Their dilemma was further intensified because ... they felt that they should tell children that recognized contemporary paintings were good. But this smacked of hypocrisy if they themselves disliked the paintings." Helen Merritt, Guiding Free Expression in Children's Art, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964.

104. The scrap materials curriculum may have been dysfunctional in many ways: "Children respond favorably for a while to such things as collage or junk constructions ... but there is only limited progress because new materials do not in themselves contribute to the basic problem of helping children's (artistic development)." Ibid. p. 51.

105. Perhaps this is a sign of change in the larger context of society. As Harry Broudy says facetiously, "The fact that serious art is now in fashion, that paintings are being stolen from museums, and that the great mass media magazines feel safe in devoting space to the arts are good signs." "Art, Science and New Values," Phi Delta Kappan, 49 (Nov. 1967) 115-19.

106. In one unprecedented experiment, the Mead Corporation lent its collection of contemporary American paintings to Elliot Eisner and Stanford's School of Education for use in the Palo Alto public schools. The paintings were hung in two elementary schools for a full year, with works in every classroom, and all of the art rotated every few weeks. Instructional materials for the teachers were provided, and parents were invited to a "gallery" night at each school.

107. "The special days in the year which we all celebrate also provide a motivating force for creative work of various sorts in a variety of materials. Thus there is realized the joyful atmosphere of Halloween and Thanksgiving, the patriotic spirit of the Washington and Lincoln anniversaries, and the spiritual expression of Christmas and Easter." Klar, Winslow, & Kirby. op. cit. p. 17.

* * * * *

The author wishes to thank Dr. Elliot Eisner, Professor of Education and Art at Stanford University, for the many helpful suggestions he offered throughout the course of the explorations which led to the writing of this paper.

This paper was presented, in shorter form, at the national conference of the American Educational Research Association, in New York City, February 1971. It has also been deposited with the federal government's ERIC clearinghouse system.